

REMARKS

I. Amendments.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 29, 47, 51, and 60 to recite that the centralized inventory system comprises an allocation logic module configured for calculation and optimization of rates for reservation proposals using revenue management business rules. This amendment is supported by paragraphs [0040] (pages 9-10) and [0044] (pages 11-12) of the specification as originally filed.

Applicants have also amended claims 2 and 47-50 to replace the term “central inventory” with the term “centralized inventory” so that the claims consistently recite this term.

No new matter has been added by any amendment herein.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claim 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the expression “the single repository of booking data” in claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome this alleged indefiniteness. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under §112.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 51-59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by US 6,854,010 to Christian et al. (“Christian”). The Examiner alleges that Christian discloses a generalized computer system for managing pricing/rating and booking of facilities of geographically distributed business entities of a hospitality organization.

Anticipation requires that each and every feature of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. Applicants submit that Christian does not anticipate the invention as claimed.

Christian discloses a management system that manages the exchange of location-level service data to a central server, and provides a secure firewall for the systems through a network transceiver at each property. (Abstract) Users access central application services and exchange data with a central server through a thin-client interface, such as a web browser (col. 3, lines 29-31).

However, Christian does not disclose a central server comprising an allocation logic module configured for calculation and optimization of rates for reservation proposals using revenue management business rules, as required by the present claims. In accordance with Applicant's amended claims, the allocation logic module comprises software which calculates and optimizes rates for reservation proposals received through various distribution channels (para. [0040], pages 9-10 of the specification as originally filed).

Accordingly, Christian does not disclose at least this feature of the pending claims. Consequently, the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims under §102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

IV. Christian in view of Patullo

The Examiner rejected claims 1-50 and 60-66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Christian in view of US 2005/0033613 to Patullo et al. ("Patullo").

Applicants submit that the comments in Section III, above, regarding the rejection of claims 51-59 under §102(e) in view of Christian, are applicable. In brief, Christian does not disclose the claimed subject matter and therefore cannot suggest Applicants' claims.

Applicants submit that Patullo does not remedy the deficiencies of Christian to suggest the pending claims, and rely on their remarks of record in distinguishing the claims over Patullo.

In brief, Patullo is directed to a reservation system for making travel arrangements via a computer network (Abstract). Patullo discloses that the reservation system comprises various hardware, including a web server **110**, a flight data server **130**, resort/airfare database **120**, and a central reservation system **150** (para. [0048]). However, Patullo does not disclose or suggest the use of an allocation logic module configured for calculation and optimization of rates for reservation proposals using revenue management business rules.

Consequently, neither Christian nor Patullo, whether taken alone or in combination, suggests the claimed invention, and the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

V. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the pending claims have been distinguished over the art of record and are in condition for allowance, which action is urgently requested. Applicants' undersigned Agent requests the courtesy of a telephone call from the Examiner if he believes that such a discussion would advance the status of the application.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fee which may be due in connection with this communication to Deposit Account 23-1703.

Dated: July 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew Fessak/
Andrew Fessak, Reg. No. 48,528
Customer Number: 007470
Direct Dial: (212) 819-8437